

**United States Department of the Interior  
Bureau of Land Management**

---

**Determination of NEPA Adequacy  
DOI-BLM-UT-Y010-2016-0067 DNA**

---

**January, 2016  
Special Recreation Permit Amendment for TEENS, Inc.**

***Location:*** *Designated mountain bike trails within the Moab Field Office:*  
Klondike Bluffs area, Lower Monitor and Merrimac, Gemini Bridges/Magnificent Seven, B  
Mountain Bike Focus Area/ Moab Brand trails.

***Applicant/Address:*** Jonathan Baumhover, Nederland, CO.

---

Moab Field Office  
82 East Dogwood  
Moab, Utah 84532  
Phone: 435-259-2100  
Fax: 435-259-2158



**Worksheet**  
**Determination of NEPA Adequacy**  
U.S. Department of the Interior  
Utah Bureau of Land Management

---

The signed CONCLUSION at the end of this worksheet is part of an interim step in the BLM's internal analysis process and does not constitute an appealable decision; however, it constitutes an administrative record to be provided as evidence in protest, appeals and legal procedures.

OFFICE: Moab Field Office

PROJECT NUMBER: MFO-Y010-13-044R

PROPOSED ACTION TITLE: Special Recreation Permit Amendment for TEENS, Inc.

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION: *Designated mountain bike trails within the Moab Field Office:* Klondike Bluffs area, Lower Monitor and Merrimac, Gemini Bridges/Magnificent Seven, Bar M Mountain Bike Focus Area/ Moab Brand trails.

APPLICANT: Jonathan Baumhover, Nederland, CO

**A. Description of the Proposed Action and Any Applicable Mitigation Measures**

Jonathan Baumhover, on behalf of TEENS, Inc., has requested an amendment to his Special Recreation Permit (SRP) to offer mountain bike tours on designated trails and areas within the Moab Field Office of the BLM. All use would be day use only with any overnight use occurring in designated campgrounds or private facilities. TEENS, Inc. has held an SRP with the Moab BLM for a period of three years. Standard stipulations as well as mountain bike specific stipulations would apply to the SRP..

**B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance**

LUP Name\* Moab Resource Management Plan

Date Approved October, 2008

\*List applicable LUPs (for example, resource management plans; activity, project, management or program plans; or applicable amendments thereto).

The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUPs because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decisions:

Page 97 of the Moab RMP reads as follows: "Special Recreation Permits are issued as a discretionary action as a means to: help meet management objectives, provide opportunities for economic activity, facilitate recreational use of public lands, control visitor use, protect recreational and natural resources, and provide for the health and safety of visitors." In addition, page 98 states: "All SRPs will contain standard stipulations appropriate for the type of activity and may include stipulations necessary to protect lands or resources, reduce user conflicts, or minimize health and safety concerns....Issue and manage recreation permits for a wide variety of uses to enhance outdoor recreational opportunities, provide opportunities for private enterprise, manage user-group interaction, and limit the impacts to such uses upon natural and cultural resources."

**C. Identify the applicable National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents and other related documents that cover the proposed action.**

Environmental Assessment DOI-BLM-UT-Y010-2014-0076, *Special Recreation Permit for Idaho State University*, (signed March 6, 2014) analyzed use of designated mountain bike trails. It was posted on the ENBB on January 2, 2014.

#### **NEPA Adequacy Criteria**

**1. Is the new proposed action a feature of, or essentially similar to, an alternative analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? Is the project within the same analysis area, or if the project location is different, are the geographic and resource conditions sufficiently similar to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? If there are differences, can you explain why they are not substantial?**

☒ Yes

☐ No

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes; the existing NEPA document addresses the impacts of permitted mountain bike, climbing and hiking tours within the Moab Field Office on the exact routes as requested by the current applicant.

**2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the new proposed action (or existing proposed action), given current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values?**

☒ Yes

☐ No

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes; Environmental Assessment DOI-BLM-UT-Y010-2014-0076 contains analysis of the proposed action and a no action alternative. The environmental concerns, interests, resource values, and circumstances have not changed to a degree that warrants broader consideration. The locations in the proposed amendment are identical to those in this EA.

**3. Is existing analysis adequate in light of any new information or circumstances (such as, rangeland health standards assessment; recent endangered species listings, updated list of BLM sensitive species)? Can you reasonably conclude that new information and new circumstances would not substantially change the analysis of the new proposed action?**

☒ Yes

☐ No

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes; the existing analysis and conclusions are adequate as there has been no new information or circumstances presented. It can be reasonably concluded that all new information and circumstances are insignificant with regard to analysis of the proposed action.

**4. Are the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects that would result from implementation of the new proposed action similar (both quantitatively and qualitatively) to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document?**

☒ Yes

☐ No

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes; the direct and indirect impacts are substantially unchanged from those identified in the existing NEPA documents. Yes; site-specific impacts analyzed in the existing document are the same as those associated with the current proposed action.

**5. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the current proposed action?**

☒ Yes

☐ No

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes; the public was notified of the preparation of Environmental DOI-BLM-UT-Y010-2014-0076, *Special Recreation Permit for Idaho State University*, was posted on the ENBB on January 2, 2014. This notification provided sufficient time for public involvement and interagency review.

**E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted:**

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Resource Represented</u>
Ann Marie Aubry	Hydrologist	Air quality; Water resources; Floodplains, Soils, Wetlands/Riparian
Katie Stevens	Outdoor Recreation Planner	Areas of Critical Environmental Concern; Wild & Scenic Rivers, Recreation, Visual Resources
Jordan Davis	Rangeland Management Specialist	Invasive Weeds, Woodland/forestry
Dave Williams	Rangeland Management Specialist	T&E Plants, RHS, Livestock Grazing, Vegetation
Jordan Davis	Rangeland Management Specialist	Invasive Plants, Woodlands
Josh Relph	Fuels Specialist	Fuels/Fire Management
Jared Lundell	Archaeologist	Cultural Resources; Native American Religious Concerns
David Pals	Geologist	Geology, Wastes
ReBecca Hunt Foster	Paleontologist	Paleontology
Pam Riddle	Wildlife Biologist	Threatened, Endangered, or Candidate Animal Species, Wildlife, Migratory Birds, Wildlife
Bill Stevens	Outdoor Recreation Planner	Wilderness, Natural Areas, Socioeconomics, Environmental Justice, Lands with Wilderness Characteristics

## **CONCLUSION**

### **Plan Conformance:**

- ☒ This proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan.
- ☐ This proposal does not conform to the applicable land use plan

### **Determination of NEPA Adequacy**

- ☒ Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitutes BLM's compliance with the requirements of the NEPA.
- ☐ The existing NEPA documentation does not fully cover the proposed action. Additional NEPA documentation is needed if the project is to be further considered.

KC Stevens  
Signature of Project Lead

1/7/16  
Date

K Stevens  
Signature of NEPA Coordinator

1/7/16  
Date

Jennifer Jones  
Signature of the Responsible Official

1/7/16  
Date

**Note:** The signed Conclusion on this Worksheet is part of an interim step in the BLM's internal decision process and does not constitute an appealable decision. However, the lease, permit, or other authorization based on this DNA is subject to protest or appeal under 43 CFR Part 4 and the program-specific regulations.

## **ATTACHMENTS:**

### **ID Team Checklist**

## INTERDISCIPLINARY TEAM CHECKLIST

**Project Title:** Special Recreation Permit Amendment for TEENS, Inc

**NEPA Log Number:** DOI-BLM-UT-Y010-2016-0067-DNA

**File/Serial Number:** MFO-Y010-13-044R

**Project Leader:** Katie Stevens

**DETERMINATION OF STAFF:** *(Choose one of the following abbreviated options for the left column)*

NP = not present in the area impacted by the proposed or alternative actions

NI = present, but not affected to a degree that detailed analysis is required

PI = present with potential for relevant impact that need to be analyzed in detail in the EA

NC = (DNAs only) actions and impacts not changed from those disclosed in the existing NEPA documents cited in Section D of the DNA form. The Rationale column may include NI and NP discussions.

The following elements are not present in the Moab Field Office and have been removed from the checklist:

Farmlands (Prime or Unique), Wild Horses and Burros.

Determination	Resource	Rationale for Determination*	Signature	Date
<b>RESOURCES AND ISSUES CONSIDERED (INCLUDES SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORITIES APPENDIX 1 H-1790-1)</b>				
NC	Air Quality Greenhouse Gas Emissions		AAubry AMA	1-6-16
NC	Floodplains		AAubry AMA	1-6-16
NC	Soils		AAubry AMA	1-6-16
NC	Water Resources/Quality (drinking/surface/ground)		AAubry AMA	1-6-16
NC	Wetlands/Riparian Zones		Mark Grover MG	1/6/16
NC	Areas of Critical Environmental Concern		Katie Stevens KS	1/7/16
NC	Recreation		Katie Stevens KS	1/6/16
NC	Wild and Scenic Rivers		Katie Stevens KS	1/6/16
NC	Visual Resources		Katie Stevens KS	1/6/16
NC	BLM Natural Areas		Bill Stevens KS	1/6/16
NC	Socio-Economics		Bill Stevens BV	1/6/16
NC	Lands with Wilderness Characteristics		Bill Stevens BV	1/6/16
NC	Wilderness/WSA		Bill Stevens BV	1/6/16
NC	Cultural Resources		Jared Lundell	1/6/16
NC	Native American Religious Concerns		Jared Lundell	1/6/16
NC	Environmental Justice		Bill Stevens	1/6/16

Determination	Resource	Rationale for Determination*	Signature	Date
NC	Wastes (hazardous or solid)		David Pals <i>DP</i>	1/6/16
NC	Threatened, Endangered or Candidate Animal Species		Pam Riddle <i>PR</i>	1/4/16
NC	Migratory Birds		Pam Riddle <i>PR</i>	1/16/16
NC	Utah BLM Sensitive Species		Pam Riddle <i>PR</i>	1/16/16
NC	Fish and Wildlife Excluding USFW Designated Species		Pam Riddle <i>PR</i>	1/6/16
NC	Invasive Species/Noxious Weeds		<i>JD</i> Jordan Davis	1/6/16
NC	Threatened, Endangered or Candidate Plant Species		<i>JD</i> Dave Williams	1/6/16
NC	Livestock Grazing		<i>JD</i> Jordan Davis	1/6/16
NC	Rangeland Health Standards		<i>JD</i> Jordan Davis	1/6/16
NC	Vegetation Excluding USFW Designated Species		<i>JD</i> Jordan Davis	1/6/16
NC	Woodland / Forestry		<i>JD</i> Jordan Davis	1/6/16
NC	Fuels/Fire Management		<i>JR</i> Josh Relph	1/6/16
NC	Geology / Mineral Resources/Energy Production		David Pals <i>DP</i>	1/6/16
NC	Lands/Access		Jan Denney	
NC	Paleontology		<i>RH</i> ReBecca Hunt Foster	1/6/16

**FINAL REVIEW:**

Reviewer Title	Signature	Date	Comments
Environmental Coordinator	<i>KC Stevens</i>	1/6/16	
Authorized Officer	<i>Jan Denney</i>	1/7/16	

**FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT  
AND  
DECISION RECORD**

**TEENS, Inc  
(Commercial Climbing, Biking and Hiking Tours)  
DOI-BLM-UT-Y010-2015-0067-DNA**

**FONSI:** Based on the analysis of potential environmental impacts contained in the present document, I have determined that the action will not have a significant effect on the human environment and an environmental impact statement is therefore not required.

**DECISION:** It is my decision to amend the Special Recreation Permit for TEENS, Inc. to include offering mountain bike tours, and to operate in the areas listed under the Proposed Action. This decision is contingent upon meeting all stipulations and monitoring requirements attached.

**RATIONALE:** The decision to amend this Special Recreation Permit for TEENS, Inc. (to include mountain biking activities) has been made in consideration of the environmental impacts of the proposed action. The action is in conformance with the Moab Resource Management Plan, which allows for recreation use permits for a wide variety of uses to enhance outdoor recreational opportunities, provide opportunities for private enterprise, manage user-group interaction, and limit the impacts to such uses upon natural and cultural resources.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Authorized Officer

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date